

10

MS#158496.01 (4964)
PATENT**REMARKS**

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Office action dated February 9, 2006 and have amended the application to more clearly set forth the invention. Claims 1-3, 5-24, and 36-39 have been amended by this Amendment B. Claims 1-3, and 5-45 are presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Examples

Examples of the operation of aspects of the present invention are shown in Appendix C. Applicants encourage the Examiner to review Appendix C for an even greater understanding of aspects of the present invention. In general, the examples refer to "email as sign in" (EASI) systems such as the Passport brand multi-site user authentication system from Microsoft Corporation. In one example, Company A (administration server) owns the a.com domain and wants to reserve and use the a.com namespace within the authentication system so that only employees of Company A may have login or sign-in names including a.com in the authentication system (e.g., sue @ a.com is one login, beth @ a.com is another login, etc.). In this manner, the employees may use their email addresses as login or sign-in names to the authentication system. Instead of having the employees go to the authentication system to create and manage their accounts, aspects of the invention enable the authentication system to delegate administration of the namespace a.com to Company A (administration server) so that the employees may manage their accounts with the authentication system via Company A (administration server).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-23 and 35-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101(a) as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that data signals embodied in a carrier wave are statutory subject matter. To further prosecution, however, claims 1-3, 5-23, and 35-38 have been amended to recite a "computer-readable storage medium". Applicants note that claim 4 was canceled by Amendment A, filed December 8, 2005.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1-3, 5-23 and 35-38 are in condition for allowance and the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn.

11

MS#158496.01 (4964)
PATENT**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4, 24, 35, 36, 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Carter et al. U.S. Pat. 6,742,114 (Carter). Applicants respectfully disagree, and assert that Carter fails to teach or suggest "associating a namespace with each of a plurality of administration servers, each of the administration servers providing a service relating to the associated namespace for one or more users" as claimed in amended independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, the rejection under § 102(e) should be withdrawn. Applicants note claim 4 was canceled by Amendment A, filed December 8, 2005.

Carter et al. discloses a principal requesting authorization from the Distributed Deputization Point (DDP). (Carter et al., column 8, lines 19-21) The DDP then sends an authentication response to the principal. (Carter et al., column 8, lines 45-46) Once authenticated, "the principal sends the DDP a deputy credential request". (Carter et al., column 9, lines 4-5). In response to this request, "the DDP creates a deputy credential". (Carter et al., column 9, lines 4-5). In other words, Carter et al. teaches that the DPP creates a deputy credential in response to the request.

In contrast, claim 1 as amended recites "associating a namespace with each of a plurality of administration servers, each of the administration servers providing a service relating to the associated namespace for one or more users". (See generally the first paragraph on page 8 of the specification, the first paragraph on page 20, the first paragraph on page 22, and elsewhere).

Carter et al. fails to teach or suggest such a limitation. For at least these reasons, amended claim 1 should be allowable. Independent claims 24, 36 and 39 have been similarly amended and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest each and every element of amended independent claims 1, 24, 36 and 39. In addition, claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and claim 35 depends from claim 24. Thus, these dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 24, 36 and 39 from which they depend and the rejection should likewise be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21, 23-25, 27-41, and 43-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (U.S. Pub. 2002/0165960) in view of Carter et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,742,114).

12

MS#158496.01 (4964)
PATENT

Applicants respectfully disagree, and assert that neither Carter et al. nor Chan, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "associating a namespace with each of a plurality of administration servers, each of the administration servers providing a service relating to the associated namespace for one or more users" as recited in amended claim 1 (See generally the first paragraph on page 8 of the specification, the first paragraph on page 20, the first paragraph on page 22, and elsewhere). Applicants note that claim 4 was canceled by Amendment A, filed December 8, 2005.

As explained above, Carter et al. teaches that the DPP creates a deputy credential in response to the request. Chan teaches a method for centralization of the repositories for policies and user identity profiles while decentralizing their administration. (Chan, paragraph 86). However, Chan fails to disclose associating a namespace with each of a plurality of administration servers and further receiving a request specifying at least one action relating to the namespace associated with the administration server to be performed by the authentication server.

Thus, Carter et al. and Chan, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest such a limitation. As such, the rejection of claim 1 under § 103(a) should be withdrawn. Claims 24, 36 and 39 have been similarly amended and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1, 24, 36 and 39 and the rejected claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Claims 22, 26 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (U.S. Pub. 2002/0165960) in view of Carter et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,742,114) further in view of Convent et al. (U.S. App. Pub. 2002/0016814). Claims 22, 26, and 42 incorporate the limitation of the amended independent claims from which depend and any intervening claims. As such, the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 22, 26, and 42. Applicants submit the claims are allowable and the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 24, 36 and 39 are allowable over the cited art. The claims depending from these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

13

MS#158496.01 (4964)
PATENT

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the claims as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,



James J. Barta, Jr., Reg. No. 47,409
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

JJB/BAW/cjl